

**Voluntary Proposers Meeting
September 14th, 2011
WSDOT NWR Dayton Cafeteria Conference Room
9:30am
Meeting Minutes**

In Attendance:

Bob Adams, Atkinson
Pam Jerpe, Atkinson
Bing Ma, Atkinson
Michael Weaver, Atkinson
Andrew Thompson, Granite
Jeannette Taylor, Jacobs
Jeremy Mason, Kleinfelder
Ray Riojas, Northwest Construction
Ian Slater, Northwest Construction
Kurt Ahrensfield, Perteet
Peter De Boldt, Perteet
Mile Standish, Service Electric
Scott Mesk, SDA
Garth Merrill, Transpo Group
Gil McNabb, WSDOT
Chad Brown, WSDOT
Cathy George, WSDOT
Hung Huynh, WSDOT
Vanessa Ness, WSDOT

Cathy George

- Explained Safety Procedures
- Explained Meeting Goals
- Introduced WSDOT participants

Hung Huynh

- Provided project description and history
- Discussed conceptual channelization changes that occurred from the RFQ to the RFP process
- Brief discussion on Environmental Permit acquisition by WSDOT that is currently in process
- Provided status update of R/W acquisition

Cathy George

- ATC (Alternate Technical Concepts) – deadline is October 11, 2011, however encourages early submittal to allow WSDOT time to provide a better review and comments before determining if it is approved, not approved or determined to not be an ATC.

Questions/Answers

Question – Who do we schedule face to face meetings with?

Answer – *Cathy George*

Question –Regarding the MOT Task Force Third Party, what are the expectations? Are the efforts defined applicable for this project since it is a smaller project? Are the videos,

pictures and meetings defined necessary for this project? Can expectations be reviewed for this project since there is a cost associated with it?

Answer – The section was consistent with the Rice Road project plus we want to ensure that we work with the local agencies, so for now assume that is all required, but WSDOT will review it. Any change will be issued in an addendum.

Question – Section 2.17 is missing?

Answer – WSDOT will check into that and issue an addendum if needed.

Question – Rule 170 & 171 work, where are they defined?

Answer – the limits are defined in Chapter 2, Technical Requirements, Section 2.3.

Question – Between the RFQ and RFP, why was the estimate revised from \$5 million to \$3.9 million?

Answer – The project was reduced to accommodate the budget. The project limits was reduced on SR 92 to eliminate wetland impacts, r/w acquisition, retaining walls, a detention pond as well as typical construction costs.

Question – Will Commitment Section (Appendix C1) of the Appendices be populated?

Answer – yes, we are waiting for the permits to determine what conditions and/or commitments will be required.

Question – MOT section, is the 4 page limit for the narrative only, not including drawings?

Answer – yes

End of Question/Answers

Cathy George

- Please call Cathy George to schedule one on one meetings. If Cathy is not available, please call Cathy's Secretary, Dawn Anderson at 206-440-4782.